



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

MLW

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/725,933	11/30/2000	Kyu Dong Kim	342310.0005	2877

7590 02/19/2004

MCGUIRE WOODS LLP  
1750 TYSONS BOULEVARD  
SUITE 1800  
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER

IRSHADULLAH, M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3623

DATE MAILED: 02/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/725,933

Applicant(s)

KIM ET AL.

Examiner

M. Irshadullah

Art Unit

3623

ML

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 15 January 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: \_\_\_\_\_.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.


Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.

10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

  
TARIQ R. HAFIZ  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The recitation "automating" was not given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A Preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

Both references teach "automating" flow of working procedures, information and applications relating to management of project, mutual collaborative activities etc., for instance, Srinivasan: Abstract, lines 1-4, wherein "designing and implementation of Auto Multi-project Server System" providing "automation of tasks of project management coordination for work-group team members" clearly infers that the reference system provides "a process of performing and controlling (managing the flow or workflow of) tasks" to be performed by the team members (work-group) of an organization, and wherein "organizational" infers that reference is concerned with a process relating to a business organization); and

Tatham et al: Col. 3, lines 58-66 {Once again primary user 30 and secondary user 40 require no specialized software except a browser and sites #1, 2, 3 in server 10 (Fig. 1) are automatically accessible to users 30 and 40, and col. 5, lines 46-48, wherein "all administrative details of the workgroup activities are automatically provided in administrative subsystem (inferring a computerized facility) which controls the day to day management of the system", and col. 6, lines 9-11 recited with lines 53-57 clearly point to system's dealing with project management.

Moreover, in response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Furthermore, Srinivasan and Tatham teach, for instance elements a) and b) of claim 1: a) a host computer that controls the system (Srinivasan: Abstract, lines 5-6 and col. 2, lines 59-61); and

In b) Srinivasan teaches all features except "an administrator", where Tatham reference was introduced, see Fig. 3e, col. 7, lines 53-54. An appropriate motivation was provided.